

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 17, 21, 29, and 31 have been amended. Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

Rejection of claims 1-8, 12-14, 21-23, 25, 27-29 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bittinger et al. (6,148,340)

Amended independent claims 1, 21, 29 and 31 provide that differences are identified between versions of the requested information, and the versions of the requested information are stored in the server. In contrast, Bittinger'340 compares a *catalog* of a new version of the requested information (i.e., container) with a previously-cached *catalog* of a previous version of the requested information, wherein each catalog merely retains an inventory of objects in the container and not the actual content in the container (as with versions of the requested information as claimed). *See* Bittinger'340, column 5, lines 28-60 (particularly lines 44-60). Indeed, as taught away from the present invention by Bittinger'340 on lines 52-53 of column 5, “[i]n either case, the actual container is then discarded from the server to conserve space.”

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-8, 12-14, 21-23, 25, 27-29 and 31-33 are allowable over Bittinger'340 and other references of record for at least the above reasons.

Rejection of claims 9-11, 15-20, 24, 26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bittinger'340 in view of other cited references

As with amended independent claims 1, 21, 29, and 31, independent claims 15 and 17 have been amended to provide that differences are identified between versions of the requested information, and the versions of the requested information are stored in the server. Thus, the aforementioned reasons allowance also apply here.

Furthermore, regarding claim 16, the PTO cited Jardin'327 at col. 6, lines 38-47 to make obvious the claim limitations of the requested information being sent by the server to the client in encrypted form while the generated difference file is transmitted in unencrypted form. Yet, a review of the cited section in Jardin'327, and indeed the entire disclosure in Jardin'327, does not

provide for such claim limitations, much less makes obvious such claim limitations. Hence, the PTO did not provide the motivation for obviousness. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the PTO has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the rejection, and claim 16 is further allowed.

Conclusion

For at least all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record, and the claims now pending patentably distinguish the present invention from the references of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited upon the filing of a continuation.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/29/2004

By:

Tiep H. Nguyen
Registration No. 44,465

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14th Street, N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005

GTM/THN/SAIC0043/36609.250585